



BEAR VALLEY
PHASE II COMMUNITY PLAN MEETING
MAY 10th, 2005
MEETING NOTES

These meeting notes are not a transcript or verbatim record of the dialogue that occurred at the community meeting. These notes are intended to capture, to the best of our ability, a summary of the discussion that occurred during the Open Discussion portion of the meeting, including comments and questions from the public and responses from County staff (and their representatives) that were provided during the meeting.

Public Question:

I feel that the essence of the community has been captured. However, since the land use plan is not changing, how will commercial and industrial be accommodated?

County Response:

Although land use changes have not been made at present, policies have been included to guide changes in the future.

Public Question:

So it will be like an overlay district?

County Response:

No. It will be a narrative that directs where future land use districts should be considered. It will give guidance to county staff and developers. There is currently a land exchange being processed that will add some industrial. We can address the need and provide a narrative description within the plan that directs future industrial and commercial development to certain areas but it is more appropriate to evaluate individual land use changes through a General Plan Amendment process which considers the specific development proposals.

Public Response to Comment:

But the outcome of the General Plan Amendment process is unpredictable, there needs to be more definitive direction and guidelines, and it is very costly.

Public Response to Comment: On the contrary, I believe that General Plan Amendments are processed too easily.

County Response: There are some opposing opinions with regard to that issue.

Public Question: I enjoyed the plan but I have some questions. On page 13, it says as the valley develops, infrastructure must be provided. How does the plan deal with a lack of services from Fire and Police?

County Response: We can include a policy that encourages an increase in services, however it is a function of available funds. In addition most rural areas recognize that there is a trade-off between having urban level services and those provided living in a more rural area. That said, to address funding we have included an implementation schedule within the appendix of the plan. The schedule includes all the policies from the plan and has been provided as a tool for the Board of Supervisors to use when prioritizing and allocating funding.

Public Question: On p. 37 – policy CI 1.8, it says the County shall require a transportation impact report for projects. Also, CI 1.9 says to work with Caltrans on developments on Bear Valley Blvd., within 300’ of a number of intersections. I am particularly concerned with the intersections at Maple Ln and Division Dr. I do not believe a traffic impact report was done in regard to the Maple Ridge development and a new pool project is going to impact Division Dr. Who do we go to if a report is not done?

County Response: The County Public Works department requires a traffic study to look at possible impacts. That serves as the County’s assessment. However, the public hearing process provides the opportunity for the public’s assessment to be heard. In addition, the environmental review process also provides the opportunity for public comment.

Public Question: On p. 49, policy CI 4.1, it says new development can proceed only when adequate water for the development is ensured. Also, CI 5.1 encourages water conservation. How and when, and by what

measure is the decision made regarding the availability of water for a project? This last year we had a great water year but it may not be the case in the future.

County Response:

Water availability for both the short and long-term was hard to get our hands around. The experts, the ones that are really able to determine water availability, really are the water districts. Water districts review the project and if the water districts say that water cannot be provided, following the policy direction within the plan would require that the County does not approve the project until water is available or an adequate water supply is assured. That is why we have included the policy which requires review of this issue during the development review process.

Public Comment:

The language seems good, but ultimately I worry that decisions are politically driven.

County Response:

The plan is a policy document to help guide future land use decisions. You cannot just walk away from this process and be assured that you are protected. The community needs to continue to be active and involved and be diligent in ensuring that the Board of Supervisors hears and responds to your needs.

Public Comment:

The community character is also defined by the look of the community. When I drive through, the houses are all unique. Tract housing like the Maple Ridge development is out of character. Also, modular homes (like tracts) are also out of character. Is there a way to slow it down or protect against these types of development?

County Response:

State law protects modular homes, requiring only a building permit to build on a legal lot of record. This is different than tract developments where the County requires a discretionary review.

Public Comment:

One issue that has not been dealt with well is the capacity of the valley. A capacity study needs to be done on a more regional/mountainwide basis.

County Response:

The plan is designed to reevaluate the overall impacts of that project on the traffic, water etc. each time an individual project is proposed. The difficulty in preparing one study/one capacity over the life of a 30 year plan is that things change. Infrastructure can be improved to meet the needs of a growing population. In terms of capacity the thing that comes closest to setting a capacity is the Land Use Policy Map. That is why we also have included a policy which requires adherence to the Land Use Policy Map.

Public Comment:

I still do not think that the process takes into account the capacity of the valley as a whole.

County Response:

There are multiple jurisdictions within the valley (City, water districts, etc.). Each jurisdiction has a Master Plan which provides a starting point for capacity analysis. Including a policy regarding coordination or potential collaboration is definitely something to consider. But quite frankly it would require endorsement not only from the Board but from all agencies involved.

Public Question:

Infrastructure always follows growth. What about education? Isn't that part of the 'infrastructure'?

County Response:

Schools will be more uniformly addressed through policies in the countywide General Plan. However the County is limited to working with schools, we do not have control over schools, but the school district does use the General Plan to assess need and establish potential school site locations.

Public Comment:

We are frustrated because the rules are not being followed. There is no follow up on projects and enforcement of regulations, and who has the accountability when things like Maple Ridge get approved?

Public Question:

Why hasn't someone done something about Maple Ridge? Who do we go to when developers do not follow their conditions of approval?

County Response:

We are not really here to talk about the problems associated with an individual project. However I

can say that some of the problems may have stemmed from the developer revising the original project proposal. Even through the developer followed the appropriate procedures there probably was not sufficient notice and the County is looking at ways to better inform the public when this happens.

Public Comment:

Not to focus again on Maple Ridge but part of the problem is not only the architecture but the grading. Maybe policies can be included in the plan which set standards for hillside development and also look at requiring that a certain amount of open space/park areas are set aside with the approval of developments.

County Response:

Good points.

Public Comment:

We also have to remember that people have private property rights.

County Response:

This plan is not a growth limiting plan. It is meant to manage growth. We are all aware that growth will happen. We are trying to plan for it and manage it appropriately.

Public Question:

The term 'adequate' is too vague. I do not feel that our fire, safety, sheriffs or CHP are 'adequate'. The decisions are left up to the politicians whose economic considerations seem to drive decisions over safety considerations. Is there a way to avoid the political process by letting the public make a determination? Can the public determine, say through a survey or annual review (or something of that sort) built into the General Plan, that services are adequate?

County Response:

Have not come across any General Plans that set this precedent. It **is** a political process, where decisions are handled by the decision-markers, in this case the Board of Supervisors.

Public Question:

There are regional issues that seem to apply to the mountain as a whole will there be a 'mountain' component of the General Plan?

County Response: Yes, the General Plan will have regional components for the Mountain, Valley and Desert.

Public Question: When and where do we provide input on this component?

County Response: Some of your input has already been received during the visioning process and through the community plan process. The regional components are being handled in concert with the overall General Plan and therefore opportunities for input will be the same as those available for the countywide General Plan. The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meets monthly and reviews draft materials, it is a public process. Also there will be additional opportunities to provide public input during the EIR process and subsequent public hearings.

County Response: The process for determining these regional policies will be done through a comparative review of general plan and community plan policies. Mountain policies will be those that commonly apply to the mountain communities. Many mountain policies are similar (i.e. Fire Safety).

Public Question: We need more commercial development, particularly in the East Valley where the majority of the zoning is residential. We need commercial in the East Valley so we don't have to drive all over town. The process would be easier if we could make that change concurrent with the plan.

County Response: We heard the concern and will take a closer look at the policies within the plan. We can look at promoting Neighborhood Commercial in logical locations (to avoid traffic and other associated problems) and to serve the neighborhood need.

Public Comment: Agree with the need for Neighborhood Commercial and it seems like the time to identify where those opportunities are, are now rather than waiting for the market to drive it. Also, affordable housing and higher density housing are not addressed.

County Response: It would be helpful if the public could provide some written comments/suggestions regarding potential locations for future commercial development.

Public Comment: We definitely need affordable housing for local workers. Also I would also like to see a policy supporting the development of a college campus. We have been working on a program for students to get their AA without leaving the mountain. It is important for the plan to recognize and memorialize the program.

County Response: Thank you for the input we will look at adding language to the plan.

Public Comment: Is noise included at the general plan level? I do not believe that noise and lights can be adequately addressed on the general plan level, needs to be at the community plan level.

County Response: Noise will be addressed from a broader perspective by the General Plan. We can include language in the community plan that addresses through the narrative that 'quiet' is a value and important characteristic of the community. However, it is difficult to set community wide standards. Noise concerns often need to be dealt with on a case by case basis due to the difficulty in measuring and judging noise without a project or use tied to it.

Public Question: Is there a mechanism for down zoning?

County Response: Zoning can go down, but typically it does not due to growth. Conservancies and land trading can be used as a method to down zone. Also if a hazard is identified, that was not previously identified (like a fault line), then down-zoning is used.

Public Comment: Trailers and campers are not being controlled to protect scenic beauty.

County Response: This is probably a code enforcement issue and we encourage you to call since enforcement is initiated on a complaint basis.

Public Comment:	Maximum build-out is only meaningful if the zoning doesn't change. The language in the document needs to be clearer on what 'Maximum Build-Out' really means.
<i>County Response:</i>	We can clarify within the document that the Maximum Build-Out is tied to the Land Use Policy Map.
Public Comment:	Subdivisions need to clear land that is adjacent to the forest in order to create a fire buffer.
<i>County Response:</i>	The Fire Safety Overlay District has requirements for buffers.
Public Comment:	Large developers need to have easements for trails. Trails can also be used to address safety issues.
<i>County Response:</i>	The plan recognizes that trails are desired within this community.
Public Comment:	What about local recreational needs, especially for kids? Does the community plan support local recreational needs in addition to recreational needs for tourists?
<i>County Response:</i>	Yes, the intent of the plan is to address recreational needs and opportunities comprehensively.